



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,368	01/21/2005	Frederick Mark Manassch	0004800USU/2279	1079
27623 7590 07/01/2009 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR STAMFORD, CT 06901				
EXAMINER WANG, KENT F				
ART UNIT 2622		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/01/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/506,368

Applicant(s)

MANASSEH ET AL.

Examiner

KENT WANG

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 and 40-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 and 40-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 and 40-60 are pending.

Response to Argument

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 23, and 43 and dependent claims 2-22, 24-38, 40-42 and 44-60 have been considered but are moot in view of the interpretation of the original cited references.

The applicant argues that Brooks does not teach capturing an interaction between a traveler and a personnel member, as in claim 1. The examiner understands the applicant's arguments but respectfully disagrees with the applicant's assessment. In response to applicant's argument, it is noted that Brooks discloses "The security system can further include a passenger identification system which can either be implemented at the airline passenger check-in counters where passengers check their luggage and receive tickets, boarding passes and/or seat assignments. At either of those locations, a passenger identification system can compare the passenger's documentary identification (passport, driver's license or other ID) with the person's identification based upon personal information and attribute data in the system." ([0048]). Thus it is a necessity by a person to accept the luggage check in by the passenger and issue tickets and a boarding passes to the passenger and/or to assign a seat. The interaction between the passenger and agent/personnel member are inherent in the action. As this is the scenario of a two-way effect is essential in the

concept of interaction, as even the opposed to a one-way causal effect. In summary, the airline passenger check-in counters can be defined as “the act or process of interacting”. These scenarios are the kind of actions that occurs as two or more objects have an effect upon one another. Applicant's arguments are not convincing.

Regarding claims 23 and 43, these claims recite same limitations as claim 1. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

With respect to dependent claims 2-22, 24-38, 40-42 and 44-60, the examiner believes his office action of 02/06/2009 is proper and accurate. Applicant's arguments are not convincing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1, 23 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brooks (US 2003/0210139).

Regarding claim 1, Brooks discloses an apparatus for the analysis (evaluation process 100, Fig 1) of at least one first captured agent-traveler interaction (at airline passenger check-in counters where passengers check their luggage) and at least one second agent-traveler interactions (at airline passenger check-in counters where passengers receive tickets, boarding passes and/or seat assignments), the apparatus comprising:

- an at least one first station (at airline passenger check-in counters where passengers first check their luggage) for capturing substantially the full audio, video, and data (the video, which including audio and data, can be recorded 24

hours a day on a system, i.e. the station can include a camera, an audio transducer, and a scanner for data, see [0042]) of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction along a path of a traveler ([0020], [0042], [0045], [0048], and [0050]);

- an at least one second station (it is noted that the passenger is checked again at airline passenger check-in counters or security gate where passengers receive tickets, boarding passes and/or seat assignments) for capturing substantially the full audio, video, and data (recorded 24 hours a day) of the at least one second agent-traveler interaction along the path of the traveler, wherein the at least one second agent-traveler station is located at a location other than the first agent-traveler station ([0020], [0045], [0048]);
- and an analysis device (an analysis system 324) for comparing the audio, video, and data of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction with the audio, video, and data of the at least one second agent-traveler interaction to determine, based upon a predetermined rule, a discrepancy (i.e. to determine suspect travel patterns and anticipate suspect activity) ([0053]).

Regarding claim 23, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that the claim 1 is an apparatus claim whereas claim 23 is a method. Thus the method claim 23 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 43, this claim recites same limitations as claim 23. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 23 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 2-17, 19, 24-32, 34-38, 40, 42, 46-47, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 2003/0210139) in view of Waters (US 6,396,535).

Regarding claim 2, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose a control station for storing the at least one first and second interactions captured. However, Waters discloses a control station (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for storing the at least one first and second interactions captured (2:46-58, Waters). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose the control station as taught by Waters, so as the synthesizer can integrating information extracted from the multiple video streams into a single display, as the alert signals may be generated when certain dangerous situations or events are recognized (2:46-48, Waters).

Regarding claim 3, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose an alarm identifier device for identifying an alarm situation based on the comparing of the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction. However, Waters discloses an alarm identifier device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1, Waters) for identifying an alarm situation (certain dangerous situation or event are recognized) based on the comparing of the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction (multiple attributed objects are analyzed to detect events) (2:46-3:2, Waters).

Regarding claim 4, the limitations of claims 1 and 3 are taught above, Waters discloses an alarm-generating device (an output device 150, i.e. a bell, Fig 1) for generating an alarm

(alerts 252, Fig 2) associated with an alarm situation (certain dangerous situation or event are recognized) identified by the alarm identifier device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) (2:46-3-2, Waters).

Regarding claim 5, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses a station poll data device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for polling stations (video streams 115, Figs 1-2) for the at least one first and second interactions (multiple video cameras 101-106, Fig 1) (2:46-3:12, Waters).

Regarding claim 6, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses a station transfer data device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for managing data (extracting temporal and spatial data from the video streams to identify objects and their attributes) transferred from stations for the at least one first and second interactions (multiple video cameras 101-106, Fig 1) (2:46-58, Waters).

Regarding claim 7, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses a database (partially attributed data objects 231, Fig 2) for storing and retrieving the at least one first and second interactions (3:18-42, Waters).

Regarding claim 8, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses a replay device (output device 120, Fig 1) for replaying at the least one first or second interactions (e.g. generating a synthetic display of multiple video cameras 101-106) (2:35-58, Waters).

Regarding claim 9, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses an object tracking device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for tracking an object within the at least one first or second interactions (various kinds of template matching schemes can be used to

fully identify specific commonly occurring objects, such as, traveler and the like) (3:32-42, Waters).

Regarding claim 10, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses at least one first and second stations (camera 101 and 102, Fig 1) comprise at least one video capturing device (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2), an at least one audio recording device (synthesizer 250, Fig 2), an at least one data capture device (data analyzer 240, Fig 2). More specifically, Waters discloses at least one video capturing device for capturing video of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2), an at least one audio recording device for capturing audio of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (synthesizer 250, Fig 2), an at least one data capture device for capturing data of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (data analyzer 240, Fig 2), an at least one storage device (a cache 530, Fig 3) and an at least one storage device (secondary data 238, Fig 2) and an at least one data retrieval device (data render 260, Fig 2) (3:4-51, Waters).

Regarding claim 11, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses at least one first station and second station are located in the same transportation port (e.g. multiple cameras can be arranged to obtain a full field of view of an area of interest) (2:21-28, Waters).

Regarding claim 12, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses at least one first station and second station are located in remote transportation ports (e.g. a camera can transmit the data element from/to a remote location) (4:17-26, Waters).

Regarding claim 13, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses a second control room for recording and storing the at least one first and second interactions (e.g. image data of camera can transmit the data element from/to a remote control location) (4:17-26, Waters).

Regarding claim 14, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses a local or remote operator for observing the operation of the apparatus (the apparatus can be under user control and the user can supply control signal to the system) (4:17-26, Waters).

Regarding claim 15, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses the control station comprises a recording and retrieval system (information extracting from digital video data 201, data generating by analyzer 240, and data converting by synthesizer 250) (3:4-51, Waters).

Regarding claim 16, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses the capturing is performed in real time to be analyzed upon capture (operating in real-time) (2:46-58, Waters).

Regarding claim 17, the limitations of claims 1 and 11 are taught above, Waters discloses the transportation port is an airport (4:27-30, Waters).

Regarding claim 19, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Waters discloses at least one first and at least one second interactions comprise a captured data, video and audio (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2, audio synthesizer 250, Fig 2, and data analyzer 240, Fig 2) depicting the interaction between the agent and the traveler (an event 242 generated by analyzing the relationships among the attributed objects, e.g. between a agent and a traveler) (3:4-51, Waters).

Regarding claim 24, this claim recites same limitations as claims 10 and 13 combined. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 10 and 13 above.

Regarding claims 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32, these claims recite same limitations as claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 above.

Regarding claims 34, 35, 36 and 37, these claims recite same limitations as claims 11, 12, 13, and 15, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 11, 12, 13, and 15 above.

Regarding claim 38, the limitations of claims 23 and 33 are taught above, Waters discloses at least one and second interactions comprise a captured data, video and audio (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2, audio synthesizer 250, Fig 2, and data analyzer 240, Fig 2) depicting the interaction between the agent and the traveler (an event 242 generated by analyzing the relationships among the attributed objects, e.g. between a agent and a traveler) (3:4-51, Waters).

Regarding claim 40, the limitations of claims 23 and 33 are taught above, Waters discloses a local or remote operator for observing the operation of the apparatus (the apparatus can be under user control and the user can supply control signal to the system) (4:17-26, Waters).

Regarding claim 42, this claim recites same limitations as claim 6. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 6 above.

Regarding claim 46, the limitations of claims 1 and 10 are taught above, Waters discloses the data capture device is a screen capture device (A security screen located at the portal screens each passenger as they pass through the portal for the presence of items such as firearms and explosives which are prohibited) (4:28-48, Waters).

Regarding claim 47, this claim recites same limitations as claim 7. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above.

Regarding claim 54, this claim recites same limitations as claim 46. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 46 above.

7. Claims 18, 20-22, 33, 41, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 2003/0210139) in view of Houvener (US 6,757,408).

Regarding claim 18, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose the interaction is associated with a baggage item. However, Houvener discloses the interaction is associated with a baggage item (the system may provide a safeguard that ensures that each passenger boarded a plane, that their luggage is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person, thus the interaction is associated with a baggage item) (6:13-25, Houvener).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the baggage check system as taught by Houvener into Brooks' system, as the combination yields a systematic process to increase the likelihood of detecting a known high-risk baggage, and minimizes the number of false positive identifications, thus provides a safeguard that ensures that luggage of each traveler is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person (6:13-25, Houvener).

Regarding claim 20, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose a quality assurance device for analyzing the at least one first or second interaction for analyzing the quality of service provided to the traveler by the agent, the quality assurance device using an at least one evaluation form of the apparatus. However, Houvener discloses a quality assurance device (an interactive multi-media training module of the identity verification system) for analyzing the at least one first or second interaction for analyzing the quality of service provided to the traveler by the agent, the quality assurance device using an at least one evaluation form of the apparatus (provides high quality data capture and screening by leveraging the interaction between screening personnel, i.e. an agent and people being screened, i.e. a traveler) (6:5-12 and 8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the interactive multi-media training module as taught by Houvener into Brooks' system, as the combination permitting a large organization to assure that their field personnel are providing high quality customer service in a method that is considerably more efficient and effective than sending them to the field for auditing and training purpose (8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Regarding claim 21, the limitations of claims 1 and 20 are taught above, Houvener discloses the quality assurance device (an interactive multi-media training module of the identity verification system) alerts a supervisor where the quality of service provided by an agent fails to meet a predetermined standard (immediately react to issue noted) (6:5-12 and 8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Regarding claim 22, the limitations of claims 1 and 20 are taught above, Houvener discloses the quality assurance device (an interactive multi-media training module of the

identity verification system) initiates a training session with an agent (the field personnel are prompted to participate in a training session at the next convenient time such as at the start of their next shift) (8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Regarding claim 33, this claim recites same limitations as claim 20. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 20 above.

Regarding claim 41, this claim recites same limitations as claim 21. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 21 above.

Regarding claim 50, the limitations of claim 23 are taught above, Houvener discloses a step of checking whether a luggage belonging to the traveler has changed (the system may provide a safeguard that ensures that each passenger boarded a plane, that their luggage is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person) (6:13-25, Houvener).

8. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 2003/0210139) in view of Waters (US 6,396,535), and further in view of Houvener (US 6,757,408).

Regarding claim 53, the limitations of claims 23 and 24 are taught above, Brooks and Waters do not disclose the visual prompting of the screener, in synchronization with the collection system, yields a systematic, uniform, natural, efficient and optimal data collection process, However, Houvener discloses the visual prompting of the screener, in synchronization with the collection system, yields a systematic, uniform, natural, efficient and optimal data collection process (6:13-25, Houvener). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the capture processor as taught by Houvener into Waters' system, as the audio, video, and data can be recorded synchronously.

9. Claims 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 2003/0210139) in view of Houvener (US 6,757,408), and further in view of Brunetti (US 6,507,278).

Regarding claim 44, the limitations of claims 1 and 20 are taught above, Brooks and Houvener do not disclose at least one first agent-traveler interaction is of a different type from the at least one second agent-traveler interaction. However, Brunetti discloses at least one first agent-traveler interaction (an ingress activity or Q section 12, Fig 1) is of a different type from the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (an egress activity or X section 14, Fig 1) (6:25-45, Brunetti).

Thus, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the ingress/egress passenger screening system as taught by Brunetti into Brooks and Houvener's system, as the ingress and egress portions of the security system can be implemented separately and operates as unobtrusively as possible without compromising security at the checkpoint, and while improving passenger flow and substantially eliminating bottlenecks (2:66-3:5 and 4:21-28, Brunetti).

Regarding claim 45, the limitations of claims 1 and 20 are taught above, Brooks and Houvener does not disclose at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction is selected from the group consisting of: ticket purchasing, baggage screening, check-in, passport control, passenger screening; and boarding. However, Brunetti discloses at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction is selected from the group consisting of: ticket purchasing, baggage

screening, check-in, passport control, passenger screening; and boarding (a multi-stage screening of passengers entering the checkpoint) (3:21-38, Brunetti).

10. Claims 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 2003/0210139) in view of Brunetti (US 6,507,278).

Regarding claim 51, the limitations of claim 23 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose at least one first agent-traveler interaction is of a different type from the at least one second agent-traveler interaction. However, Brunetti discloses at least one first agent-traveler interaction (an ingress activity or Q section 12, Fig 1) is of a different type from the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (an egress activity or X section 14, Fig 1) (6:25-45, Brunetti).

Thus, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the ingress/egress passenger screening system as taught by Brunetti into Brooks' system, as the ingress and egress portions of the security system can be implemented separately and operates as unobtrusively as possible without compromising security at the checkpoint, and while improving passenger flow and substantially eliminating bottlenecks (2:66-3:5 and 4:21-28, Brunetti).

Regarding claim 52, the limitations of claim 23 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction is selected from the group consisting of: ticket purchasing, baggage screening, check-in, passport control, passenger screening; and boarding. However, Brunetti discloses at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction is selected from the group consisting of: ticket purchasing, baggage screening, check-in,

passport control, passenger screening; and boarding (a multi-stage screening of passengers entering the checkpoint) (3:21-38, Brunetti).

11. Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Waters, and further in view of Eilbacher (US 6,724,887).

Regarding claim 48, the limitations of claims 23 and 47 are taught above, Brooks and Waters do not disclose the analysis is spotting words said by the traveler. However, Eilbacher discloses the spotting words analysis technique (an analyzing unit 234 is a voice processing stress analyzer, in the case of word spotting, an analysis is performed on recorded audio such as a telephone call and the audio is automatically processed, searching for any key words on a predefined list which have been identified as cause for concern) (11:26-61, Eilbacher).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the spotting words analysis technique as taught by Eilbacher into Brooks and Waters' system, as the word spotting analysis can be done separately, or in addition to the stress analysis, which might tend to indicate an suspected customer experience, as the analysis is spotting words said by the traveler (11:26-61, Eilbacher).

Regarding claim 49, the limitations of claims 23 and 47 are taught above, Brooks and Waters do not disclose the analysis is stress detection of the traveler. However, Eilbacher discloses the stress detection and analysis technique (an analyzing unit 234 is a voice processing stress analyzer which can be used to perform the stress detection of the traveler) (11:26-61, Eilbacher).

12. Claims 55-56 and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of O'Hara (US 2003/0058084).

Regarding claim 55, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose the rule assesses a change in an item associated with said traveler. However, O'Hara discloses the rule assesses a change in an item associated with said traveler (traveler's name or address) ([0025], O'Hara). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the method as taught by O'Hara into Brooks' system, as it enables the display of travel information in order to enable the ticket agent the ability to create a complete record of the person seeking passage on a carrier ([0025], O'Hara).

Regarding claim 56, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose the rule assesses a disparity between an item carried by said traveler, and said traveler's destination. However, O'Hara discloses the rule assesses a disparity between an item carried by said traveler, and said traveler's destination (traveler's intended destination) ([0037], O'Hara).

Regarding claims 58 and 59, these claims recite same limitations as claims 55 and 56, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 55 and 56 above.

13. Claims 57 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Ritter (US 7,084,736).

Regarding claim 57, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brooks does not disclose the rule assesses a change in said traveler's appearance. However, Ritter discloses the rule assesses a change in said traveler's appearance (traveler's outer appearance) (claim 1, Ritter). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the

method as taught by Ritter into Brooks' system, as it enables the system to allow or den the traveler access to the public transportation after said verifying and checking (claim 1, Ritter).

Regarding claim 60, this claim recites same limitations as claim 57. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 57 above.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Kelly et al. (US 2003/0127511) discloses a method for providing passenger accountability for airports and other mass transit facilities,
- Yagesh et al. (US 2003/0171939) provides an integrated knowledge management system specifically configured for the tracking, monitoring and management of hazardous materials, and
- Chun (US 6,956,477) provides a multichannel image processor and a security system employing the same capable of remote controlling the movement of a camera from a user's computer, and setting up a function supported from the camera.

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH**

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Wang whose telephone number is 571-270-1703. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 PM (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)? If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/506,368

Page 19

Art Unit: 2622

/Tuan V Ho/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622

KW

16 June 2009